双语经典

Introduction to *Qi zhui ji*

Zhang Longxi

On the world stage, as well as in China, Qian Zhongshu (1910 – 1998) was one of the most learned humanist scholars of our time. We may think of him in the company of such savants as Erich Auerbach or Ernst Robert Curtius except that in addition to his vast knowledge of the Western tradition, read in five or six languages (English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Latin), Qian also had an encyclopedic familiarity with the Chinese tradition and was himself a master of classical Chinese. "His knowledge of Chinese literature, of the Western tradition, and of world literature is immense (Sa connaissances de la littéreture chinoise, du patrimoine occidental, de la littéreture universelle, est prodigieuse)," as Pierre Ryckmans observed in *Le Monde* as early as 1983. "There is no one like Qian Zhongshu today in China, not even in the world (Qian Zhongshu n'a pas son pareil aujourd'hui en Chine et même dans le monde)."[①] I have cited this remark several times on different occasions simply because its statement is true, and its truthfulness does not diminish with repeated citations. Despite his incredible erudition and his enormously high reputation in China, however, and despite his election as an honorary member of the Modern Language Association of America in 1985, Qian Zhongshu's name and works remain very little known in the West except in a small circle of Sinologist. And yet Qian's scholarship is not confined to China studies or literary studies, for his magnum opus, the modestly named *Guan zhui bian* or *Limited Views*, is so quintessentially interdisciplinary, contains such insightful discussions of Chinese classics in an intertextual dialogue with Western works, and comments on so many different subjects and fields that it becomes very difficult to classify it and put it under a subject heading in any library catalogue system.[②] For understanding the Chinese tradition in the context of East-West comparisons, Qian Zhongshu's works represent the

① Pierre Ryckmans, "Fou de chinois," LeMonde, June10,1983,p.15.

② In my university library, the book is put under PL anyway, but that is totally arbitrary and misleading, because PL usually covers books in Chinese literature.

very best of contemporary scholarship, and it is high time that we brought out translations and critical evaluations of his works for the appreciation and recognition they so richly deserve.

With the rising interest in China and its culture, the situation has started to improve in recent years, and some of Qian Zhongshu's works are now available in English translation. His only novel, *Fortress Besieged*, which C. T. Hsia praised "for its delightful portrayal of contemporary manners, its comic exuberance, and its tragic insight," [①] was translated by Jeanne Kelly and Nathan Mao and published by Indiana University Press in 1979, reissued more recently by New Directions in 2004. Qian's major scholarly work, *Guan zhui bian*, a real treasure trove of knowledge and wisdom, is now at least partially available in English. Out of the original five-volume set, Ronald Egan selected and expertly translated 65 passages under the title of *Limited Views*, which was published by Harvard University Asia Center in 1998. A collection of Qian's essays and short stories, Humans, Beasts, and Ghosts, edited and largely translated by Christopher Rea, was brought out by Columbia University Press in 2011. In the present volume, we have yet another important work, a collection of seven essays by Qian Zhongshu, originally entitled *Qi zhui ji* (literally "seven stitched-together collection"), now beautifully translated by Duncan Campbell as *Patchwork: Seven Essays on Art and Literature*, and published by Brill to inaugurate our East Asian Comparative Literature and Culture book series.

First published in 1984, this collection contains essays with consistently developed arguments on particular themes and are written in elegant modern vernacular, as distinct from Qian's two other scholarly works, the massive *Guan zhui bian* or Limited Views and the much expanded *Tan yi lu* or *On the Art of Poetry*, both written in classical Chinese in the traditional form of loosely connected notes and commentaries. The present collection represents Qian's works in the modern form of critical essays written in the modern vernacular, but these essays include, as all his writings do, numerous quotations in classical Chinese and several European languages. The first essay in this collection is on poetry and painting; it offers, as the author states at the beginning, "no appraisal of either old Chinese poetry or old Chinese painting in and of themselves," but "an elucidation of the comparative evaluation given these two arts within traditional Chinese criticism." A critical examination of the "comparative evaluation" of poetry and painting becomes necessary because some often-heard conventional views would have it, particularly since the Song dynasty, that painting is "soundless poetry," while poetry is "paintings of sound," as though these two forms of art share the same origin and the same criteria in aesthetic judgment. Modelled on the division of Chan Buddhism, Dong Qichang (1555 – 1636), a famous painter and scholar of the Ming dynasty, divided traditional painting into the Southern and the Northern schools and traced that division back to the Tang. Painting of the Southern school with the Tang poet and painter Wang Wei (701 – 761) as initiator and the first patriarch became the orthodoxy in traditional painting, but poetry of the so-called "Spiritual Resonance School," which was close to the Southern school of painting in style and artistic principles, never occupied the position of the orthodoxy or mainstream in traditional poetry. Even though Wang Wei is also a well-known poet, he has never been ranked high enough to compete with Du Fu, Li Bo, or Tao Yuanming in critical evaluation. By citing a wealth of textual evidence, Qian Zhongshu thus demonstrates a fundamental discrepancy in the evaluation of painting and poetry in traditional criticism, for "traditional literary criticism denied that the Spiritual Resonance School represented the most conventional poetic style, traditional art criticism on the other hand acknowledged the Southern School of Painting as representing the

① C. T. Hsia, A History of Modern Chinese Fiction, 2nd ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 434.

most conventional style of painting. On this issue of 'canonicity' and 'orthodoxy,' ancient Chinese 'poetry and painting' certainly do not embody 'the same rules.'" In other words, the conventional view of poetry and painting as sharing the same criteria does not stand up to critical scrutiny.

That poetry and painting are sister arts is also a traditional idea in Western criticism, for which Horace's ut pictura poesis has often been misconstrued to provide a classic testimony. "To regard poetry and painting as twin sisters is a concept that was to become a cornerstone of Western literary and artistic theory," says Qian. "Indeed, it was precisely this concept that Lessing sought to sweep away as he viewed it as a stumbling block." The second essay in this collection is a multi-layered reading of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's famous work, *Laokoon*. One important point Qian Zhongshu made first is his strongly held view that critical insights and brilliant ideas contained in short phrases and fragmented expressions, undeveloped systematically as they are, may just be as valuable as tomes of systematic theoretical articulations. In fact, theories come and go, says Qian, and "those things of value that do remain after the collapse of complete theoretical systems are but partial ideas," which are, "by their very nature, fragmentary." Thus he concludes: "A viewpoint that pays attention only to major theories or that holds such isolated sentences or phrases in contempt, intoxicated with quantity and thus ignoring a gram of worth for a ton of verbiage, is superficial and vulgar—if it is not in fact an excuse for laziness and sloppiness."

With that in mind, Qian is able to argue that in their short and fragmented expressions, the ancient Chinese had often realized the same principal idea in Lessing's argument that painting as spatial art cannot represent things and events that poetry as temporal art can express with ease and brilliance. Among the many examples, a particularly memorable one Qian provided is a comment the painter Gu Kaizhi (ca. 345 – ca. 400) made on Xi Kang's (223 – 262) two poetic lines: "The eye escorts the homing geese. / The hand sweeps over the five-stringed lute." Gu was recorded as saying: "To paint 'The hand sweeps over the five-stringed lute' is easy, but to paint 'The eye escorts the homing geese' is difficult." The line describing a momentary action of the hand sweeping over the lute can be easily represented in a painting, but the line portraying a gradual movement of the geese flying home to their nests, and the eye "escorting" the birds by following their movement across the sky from one point to the next, cannot be drawn or painted in one frame. In that brief comment, as Qian observes, Gu Kaizhi already realized "the issue of transition over time of the kind that Lessing discusses."

Lessing's theoretical argument is not thoroughgoing enough, however, for what cannot be depicted in painting covers much more than the temporal dimension Lessing discussed. Many sensory perceptions or moods often written about in Chinese poetry are also difficult to paint, such as smell ("fragrance"), touch ("soaks," "chills"), hearing ("sound of choking," "resounding like a bell and sounding like a stone chime"), or a state of mind ("dreaming of home"), all of which do not have obvious external manifestations and are not, as Qian puts it, "simply a question of time and space." The way poets depict colors or gradations of brightness or darkness is also hard to represent pictorially. For example, Li He (790-816) describes the "will-o'-the wisp" in a famous line: "The lacquer-black light of ghostly lamps illuminates the pinetree seeds"; and John Milton describes the horrible dungeon in hell as "No light, but rather darkness visible"; and the devil shooting at God's angels with "black fire." The "lacquer-black light," "darkness visible" and "black fire" are all impossible to paint, or at least not as effectively as represented in poetry. A simple poetic metaphor would make a painter despair because the basic principle of metaphorical expression is putting two different things together that partially overlap, but never the same, and it is thus impossible to draw

or portray the metaphorical relationship that depends on our understanding of that partial overlapping. It is perfectly fine, for example, to compare a mountain peak to a camel's hump metaphorically, but a painting of a mountain in the shape of a camel would appear very strange and in any case inadequate. These are some of the aspects that Lessing did not touch on in Laokoon, so Qian's discussion expanded the range of Lessing's theoretical insights to a wider coverage.

What Qian Zhongshu points out most emphatically in this essay, however, is Lessing's contribution to literary and artistic theory with his concept of the suggestive "moment" (Augenblick). Painting as spatial art is static and depicts just one particular moment in time, so the "pregnant moment" with the climax about to happen is crucial for a painter or a sculptor to choose for representation. Literary narrative as the temporal form of art can tell a story from the beginning to the end without the restriction of time, but we find story tellers also make use of the concept of the "moment" for different purposes. Quite often, "the narrative breaks off in medias res, the story ending or the curtain falling just the moment before the climax," says Qian. "The audience is thus forced to come to their own conclusions about how it was to end. In other words, this principle of the 'heavily pregnant moment' can find full application within the literary arts as well." In the many examples Qian cited, the Chinese critic Jin Shengtan (1610? – 1661) is perhaps most conscious of this particular concept as a narrative technique. "The most marvelous aspect of writing is when although all attention may be riveted upon a certain matter," says Jin, "the author does not write of this matter directly, but rather sets off towards it from a point far distant to it, approaching the matter in a roundabout way, and halting just before he broaches it." That is to say, in narrative fiction, the author builds up the momentum and leads the reader towards a climactic point, but the narrative deliberately breaks off just before reaching that point, leaving the reader with intensified interest and attention, desperately wanting to know what is going to happen next. Jin Shengtan's commentaries make us realize, as Qian remarks, "that 'heavily pregnant moments' are not only appropriately used at the conclusion of short stories, but may also be used as narrative linking within full-length novels." Of course, the technique to keep reader's interest and desire by disrupting the narrative flow is not only used in Chinese fiction, but also in European novels and narrative poems. From Dante and Chekhov to George Sand, Otto Ludwig, Ariosto and Charles Reade, Qian Zhongshu collected a large number of textual evidences from Western literature in addition to the numerous examples from Chinese to show that all those "moments of suspense" and narrative techniques are all variations of what Lessing articulated as a theoretical concept. "When Lessing spoke of 'heavily pregnant moments,'" says Qian, "he was discussing exclusively the plastic arts. Unwittingly, however, he also provided the literary arts with an extremely useful concept." Thus Qian puts Lessing's theoretical contribution to the foreground and makes us realize how important and how widely used the concept of Augenblick is in literature as well as in the fine arts.

The first two essays in this collection discuss painting and poetry, two other essays, "Synaesthesia" and "Poetry as a Vehicle of Grief," constitute another cluster of thematic studies. Starting with a famous poetic line by Song Qi (998 – 1061) that "Upon red apricot branch-tips, spring's ardour clamours," and several critics' dispute of using the word "clamour" to depict "spring's ardour," Qian Zhongshu quoted some other poets and writers of the Song dynasty to prove that Song Qi's usage was not all that unusual. "The word 'clamour' speaks of the soundless aspect of objects as if they gave off waves of sound, and seemingly we experience an auditory sensation through the sense of sight." This seemingly illogical usage or confusion of sensory perceptions is not an isolated phenomenon found only in Chinese poetry,

for Western languages also have words like "loud," "criard," "chiassoso," "chillón," and "knall," originally all meant to describe the effect of noisy sound, but used to describe colors that are too bright or strong. The many Western examples may "assist our understanding of the usage of this word 'clamour' in ancient Chinese poetry," says Qian. "To employ the terminology of psychology or linguistics, such usages are examples of what is called 'synaesthesia' or 'the transference of the senses.'"

It is characteristic of Qian's style that a great number of examples are cited from Chinese and Western sources to provide a rich pool of textual evidence to argue for the ubiquitous presence of "synaesthesis." From common words and phrases in daily language to poetic expressions and philosophical discourse, from Aristotle's claim that "sound was to be divided into the 'sharp' and the 'heavy,' as 'used by analogy from the sense of touch,'" to the metaphoric description of sound effect in the Chinese *Record of Music*, from the Tang poet Bai Juyi's description of music to Western literary examples from Homer to the late 19th-century symbolists, from the Western mystics to the Chinese Taoists and Buddhists and their "merging the perceptions of the various senses into one, amalgamating them as mystical experience," the numerous examples Qian gathered together make a convincing case of the importance of synaesthesia. And yet, despite the ubiquitous manifestations of "synaesthesia" in the Chinese and the Western traditions, as Qian observes, it seems to be a phenomenon "ancient critics and rhetoricians alike appear neither to have fully understood nor in fact been at all conscious of." Even the great philosopher Aristotle, though he "mentions synaesthesia in his *De Anima*, he does not discuss it at all in his *Rhetorika*." But for that very reason, Qian Zhongshu's essay becomes all the more valuable; once he has singled out "synaesthesia" as a critical concept and given it an exhaustive treatment, we come to understand it with all the freshness of a discovery and thereby acquire a new perspective to understand the many examples of its presence.

The same is true with the notion that "poetry can give vent to grievances," which, as an important critical notion, was again not paid much attention to in traditional criticism. When Confucius talks about the uses of poetry in the *Analects* (xvii.9)—that poetry can give rise to high spirits (*xing*), can be used to observe social conditions (*guan*), to reconcile and unite communities (*qun*), and to give vent to grievances (*yuan*)—the critical notion discussed in this essay is just one of the four functions, and comes as the last of the four. But by drawing on both the Western and the Chinese literary and cultural traditions and gathering numerous textual evidences, from Nietzsche and Freud to Croce, from Sima Qian (ca. 145 – ca. 85 B.C.) and Zhong Rong (ca. 465 – 518) to Han Yu (768 – 824), Qian Zhongshu clearly demonstrates that it is a widely accepted view in both China and the West "that pain engenders poetry more than pleasure does, that good poetry is, in the main, an expression or discharge of the emotions of unhappiness, anxiety or frustration." As I remember distinctly, Qian Zhongshu told me in a private conversation I had with him in Beijing in 1981 or 1982, that the title of this essay, "Poetry as a Vehicle of Grief," which is a famous quote from the Confucian Analects, could be rendered as "Our Sweetest Songs," if the essay was ever to be translated into English, because that is likewise a famous quote from P. B. Shelley's "To a Skylark"—"Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought," which gives the central idea discussed in this essay a beautiful and brilliant expression.

Of the many examples Qian cited to argue his case in the essay, the use of the image of pearl stands out as a particularly striking metaphorical expression of this idea. Commenting on the works of Feng Yan, an Eastern Han dynasty writer, in his famous treatise *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons*, Liu Xie (ca. 465 – 522) used a peculiar analogy to say that Feng's fine literary works were produced out of

his frustration and sorrow that his talents were not appreciated in his time, and this is compared to "a pearl bred by the sickness of an oyster." Another scholar Liu Zhou (514 – 565) also expressed a similar idea with the same metaphor when he says: "The cedar droops to develop the most beautiful knobs; the oyster sickens to mature the moon-bright pearl." The two scholars' use of the image of pearl can be traced back to a remark made by Liu An, the Prince of Huainan (179 – 122 B. C.), that "the pearl as bright as the moon is beneficial to us, but for the oyster it is the result of a disease."① This interesting remark changes our perspective and enables us to see the bright pearl as the outcome of pain and suffering of a sick oyster rather than a precious piece of jewelry. This is in itself a quite extraordinary shift of perspective, and when the idea is borrowed by critics to speak of literary creation, it becomes a beautiful metaphor for the idea that best poetry comes from pain and suffering. Such a particular metaphor, however, is not just Chinese, but can also be found in Western literature. Qian Zhongshu says:

> *One of the analogies employed by European critics in discussing the making of literature is surprisingly close to this Chinese one. Poetry is, according to Franz Grillparzer, like the pearls produced by some mute, ailing mollusc (die Perle, das Erzeugnis des kranken stillen Musscheltieres). Gustave Flaubert thinks that if a pearl is produced by the oyster in disease (la perle est maladie de l'huître), then the style of a writer is fashioned by some deeper sorrow for the expression of that sorrow (l'ecoulement d'une douleur plus profonde). Heinrich Heine wonders whether poetry to the poet is not as the pearl to the poor oyster, the malady that causes the pain and the suffering (wie die Perle, die Krankheitsstoff, woran das arme Austertier leidet). And A. E. Housman observes that poetry is "a secretion," whether "natural...like the turpentine in the fur," or "morbid...like the pearl in the oyster." The pearl / oyster analogy may thus be said to have been very commonly used, perhaps because it accurately suggests how poetry is written in a state of "agitation" and can be regarded as a "vehicle of grief."*

Reading this passage, we cannot but marvel how such unexpected affinities in literary minds can exist among poets Chinese and Western, and such surprising similarities in the formation of a poetic metaphor can so coincide across linguistic and cultural differences; moreover, we cannot but admire even more Qian Zhongshu's incredible erudition, not only that he read everything, but that he had such excellent memory and paid such close attention to textual details that he could have put together the specific uses of pearl as a particular metaphor for poetry in different languages to prove the universality of the idea that poetry touches our heart most powerfully when it is produced out of the poet's painful lived experience, just as the pearl is produced out of the pain of a suffering oyster. Once Qian Zhongshu has shown us the numerous examples of literary works and critical commentaries, Confucius's remark in the *Analects* and Liu Xie's use of the pearl as a metaphor can suddenly be seen in a different light as an important critical concept with implications for both literary creation and critical evaluation.

The remaining three essays in this collection all deal with translation and reception of literary works, and the first two recapture the spirit of the time in late Qing dynasty when Western literature was translated into Chinese and started its eventful and sometimes bizarre adventure within a very different cultural milieu. With a masterful hand of a novelist, a satirist, as well as a cultural historian,

① Ouyang Xun 歐陽詢 (557 – 641), Yiwen leiju 藝文類聚 [Literary Texts Classified in Categories], ed. Wang Shaoying 汪紹楹, 2 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1982), 2:1675.

these essays unfold before our eyes a vivid picture of the intellectual world of the late Qing period, and offer us an opportunity to catch a glimpse of the knowledge structure and cultural mentality of the literati elites at the time. Lin Shu (1852 – 1924) was an old-fashioned scholar with no knowledge of any foreign language, but he translated more than 170 Western novels with great success in collaboration with several assistants. As a traditional scholar, however, he valued his own ancient-style prose most and did not like others talking about his translation without first valuing his literary prose. Kang Youwei (1858 – 1927) wrote a poem in praise of his translation, saying that "This era's twinned geniuses of translation we account Yan Fu and Lin Shu"; but in doing so, Kang "had actually managed to offend both Yan Fu and Lin Shu with this line of poetry. Yan Fu had always held Lin Shu in contempt. When he saw this poem, he held that Kang Youwei was talking nonsense for how in the world could there be a 'genius of translation' who knew not a word of a foreign language." Lin Shu was not pleased, either, because Kang spoke of his translation of foreign novels "instead of mentioning first his Ancient Prose," and also because Kang's poem was supposed to pay tribute to Lin rather than Yan, and yet he put Yan's name before Lin's in that poetic line. In a humorous vein, Qian Zhongshu describes such "vanity fair" type silly behavior of these men of letters, their "mutual recriminations and jealousies," which are often stuff for satire and good laughs. "As long as such rivalry does not degenerate into heartless, meaningless and shameless strife and enmity," says Qian, "it may yet be considered but a light-hearted scene from la Comédie humaine." Looking back in history, we may say that Lin Shu and his contemporaries were yet lucky to be able to indulge themselves in such petty and harmless "battle of the books," because "heartless, meaningless and shameless strife and enmity" did befall later generations of Chinese intellectuals and poisoned the social atmosphere in China for a long period of time.

Literati in the late Qing and the early Republican period did not take translation seriously; they even doubted that Westerners could have anything like poetry or literature. After the Opium Wars, cultural pride became more indispensable among the literati elites as everyone realized that China could not compete with the West in weaponry and technology. As Qian Zhongshu remarks: "Whereas they could but acknowledge that in terms of science China was less advanced than the West, they regarded literature as the basis for their feelings of racial superiority." Qian also notes that "people from other ancient Eastern nations harboured similar attitudes, Edmond de Goncourt recording the fact that a Persian had once told him that although Europeans were able to manufacture clocks and various kinds of machinery and were otherwise very able, they nevertheless were not as brilliant as Persians, for did Europe also have men of letters and poets (si nous avons des littérateurs, des poètes)?" Though Lin Shu did not put much value on his own translation as part of his writings, he at least realized that foreigners had novels worth translating, and in that respect, says Qian, "Lin Shu's perception surpassed that of his more talented and learned contemporaries." In the essay on the translation of Longfellow's "Psalm of Life," Qian mentioned Zhang Deyi (1847 – 1919), one of the earliest graduates and a prize student of the Interpreters' College, and contrasted him with Lin Shu. Zhang Deyi apparently had an excellent command of English, was sent on diplomatic missions to Europe and America, and had recorded his experience on those journeys in detailed diary entries, but he had neither interest nor understanding of Western literature, mistaking the social satire of *Gulliver's Travels* as factual account of some African tribes. "At the very same time that Zhang Deyi was in London recording such ingenuous opinions, Lin Shu and Wei Yi were in the process of completing a translation of *Gulliver's Travels* in China," says Qian. "Lin Shu never travelled abroad

and understood not a word of English, while Wei Yi never had the benefit of a university education." But putting together Lin Shu's "Preface" to his translation of *Gulliver's Travels* (1906) and Zhang Deyi's diary entry on the same novel written the year before, Qian remarks, "it is not at all difficult to decide which of these two men had a greater understanding of Western literature."

Given his ignorance of any foreign language and the not particularly high level of linguistic competence of his collaborators, Lin Shu's many mistakes, his sins of omission and commission, and his absurd mistranslations are easy—perhaps all too easy—to be identified and ridiculed. Qian Zhongshu did poke fun at those mistakes, which makes very enjoyable reading, but more importantly, it is with respect and admiration that Qian acknowledges Lin Shu's contribution to the introduction of Western literature to Chinese readers at a time when most literati-officials were woefully ignorant of anything Western. Qian recalls the joy of reading Western novels in Lin Shu's vivid and elegant prose as "one of my great discoveries at the age of eleven or twelve." It was in Lin Shu's translations that he realized "how enchanting Western fiction could be." Though supposed to replace an unintelligible original, translation may sometimes "inveigle" readers into a foreign world and generate in them a strong sense of curiosity to study the foreign original. That was exactly what happened to Qian in his teenage years. "I read and re-read Lin Shu's translations of the works of Rider Haggard, Dickens, Washington Irving, Sir Walter Scott and Jonathan Swift in a fit of insatiability," says Qian. "To the extent that I was then at all conscious of my motives for studying English, one of them would have been the hope that some day I would be able to read, to my heart's content, all the adventure stories of Haggard and company in their originals." Translation as mediation between languages and cultures can sometimes distort and mislead, but it is absolutely crucial and indispensable in the cultural interactions between nations. As Qian Zhongshu argues:

> *A translation acts the role of an intermediary or liaison officer, introducing everybody to foreign literary works, encouraging in them a love for such works. Performing a function somewhat akin to that of matchmaker, a translation establishes "Literary Affinities" (wenxue yinyuan) between nations. Of all the "affinities" between nations, this is the type least likely to provoke disharmony, squabbling and fisticuffs.*

When two cultures meet in their first encounters, translation, however difficult, faulty, and inadequate, constitutes the necessary first step towards mutual understanding, an indispensable bridge crossing over the gaping linguistic and cultural differences. The difficulties, the faults, and the inadequacies are all in themselves meaningful in hindsight as part of the effort to take the first step and the hard work in building the first bridge, which have made it possible for us to arrive where we are today. Perhaps that is the reason why we find Qian Zhongshu's essay on the late Qing translation of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's "A Psalm of Life" so fascinating in spite of, or perhaps because of, the many misunderstood words, awkward expressions, willfully modified meanings, and the other defects and failings that bewilder early translators. The historical picture recreated in Qian's essay with all the intriguing details and presented with a sense of humor and irony is indeed captivating. In the mid-1860s, Thomas Wade (1818 – 1895), an interpreter promoted to be the British Minister to China, made a draft translation of Longfellow's "Psalm of Life," and Dong Xun (1810 – 1892), at the time in charge of the Office of Foreign Affairs, rephrased the draft in a series of seven-character quatrains and wrote the poem on a fan. The Chinese fan was then brought by the American diplomat Anson Burlingame (1820 – 1870) to Longfellow himself as a gift at the Craigie

House in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1865. Wade's command of Chinese was obviously not good enough to translate Longfellow's poem adequately, so his draft sometimes fails to make sense or very poorly, while Dong Xun knew no foreign language and had to work with a draft he could only make half sense of, supplying the other half by guessing what he could and then rewriting the poem in almost total disregard of what the original might say, which, as Qian Zhongshu comments sarcastically, "accords well with Johann Gottfried Herder's claim that the translation of a poem should be one's own creation based upon and in imitation of the original (nachdichten, umdichten)." Unfortunately, Dong Xun could not even base his rewriting on Longfellow's original, but on Wade's "crabbed and almost inarticulate version," so the end-result could not be anything like a real translation. Qian continues in his sarcastic vein: "Robert Frost defined poetry as being: 'What gets lost in translation.' Christian Morgenstern considered that translations of poetry could 'merely be divided into those that were bad and those that were less bad' (Es gibt nur schlechte Übersetzungen und weniger schlechte), which is to say that if they were not worse, they were bad." The early translation of Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" seems to provide a testimony to these disparagements of literary translation.

Again, it is easy to find fault with such early and inadequate translations, particularly of poetry, but when we look back at the social and historical conditions of the time, we may find it amazing that a poem like Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" could have been translated into Chinese at all! The ancient Chinese were terribly ethnocentric and the dichotomy between the Chinese as civilized hua and foreigners as uncivilized barbaric yi was deeply ingrained in traditional thinking. As Qian Zhongshu reminds us, it is a "long-standing tradition in China" that the barbarians speak the language of birds and animals. In the Rites of the Zhou Dynasty, one of the Confucian classics, it is stipulated that "those official posts entrusted with the 'duty of talking with the birds' or 'communicating with the beasts' ought to be filled by Southern Barbarians and Northern Barbarians," because "such barbarians could communicate with the birds and the beasts." Ancient Greeks held very similar views, and animal symbolism is widely used in a variety of ways in different cultures. As G. E. R. Lloyd observes, not only are animals used to symbolize human characters or traits, but "representations of other peoples as or as like animals is very common (it flourished in early modern Europe especially)." ① In late Qing China, such a view still predominated among literati-officials. As late as 1887, as Qian tells us, Weng Tonghe (1830-1904), a leading figure in the late Qing court, wrote in his diary near the Chinese New Year's Day that, upon seeing ambassadors of various nations coming for New Year greetings, he "avoided them by standing off in the Western wing and looked on at the proceedings from afar. There were more than twenty people there and Marquis Zeng Jize talked with them in their own barbarian language, sounding to me like the incessant chirping and warbling of birds." Zeng Jize was one of the very few officials in late Qing court who could speak the "barbarian language," but whether it was English or French they were speaking, "in the ears of a person who took the pains to shun the company of foreign devils as did Weng Tonghe, it all sounded like the endless cackle-cackle of birds." In a cultural environment like this, few Chinese officials knew any foreign language, let alone anything about foreign literature, and this was true not only of staunch conservatives, but even of those who were involved in foreign affairs and went on diplomatic missions in the West.

Qian Zhongshu took Li Fengbao (1834 – 1887) as one example of the kind of cultural ignorance because of cultural pride. Li was the Chinese diplomat stationed in Berlin and it so

① G. E. R. Lloyd, Ancient Worlds, Modern Reflections: Philosophical Perspectives on Greek and Chinese Science and Culture (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), p. 102.

happened that another diplomat, Bayard Taylor, the American Minister to Germany and famous translator of Goethe's *Faust*, died in Berlin in 1878. Li Fengbao attended Taylor's funeral and, as he recorded in his diary, it was at Taylor's funeral that he learned about Goethe as being not only a poet, but also one of Duke of Saxe-Weimar's ministers, decorated with several medals awarded by the Tsar of Russia and the King of France. This is the first time Goethe's name appears in a Chinese text, but Li came to learn about Goethe only because he attended the American diplomat Taylor's funeral. "An incumbent Chinese official gains knowledge of a German official of a previous generation from the recent death of an American official," says Qian in a sarcastic tone; "among officials, they seem to have what Goethe himself spoke of as 'elective affinities' (Wahlverwandtschaften)." Even though the Qing officials sent to Europe and America were all educated in traditional Chinese learning, many of whom, such as Guo Songtao, Zeng Jize, Xue Fucheng, and a few others, were pretty good writers and poets themselves, in their diaries and other writings there is "not a mention of Shakespeare."

Under such circumstances, it was really amazing that Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" was translated into Chinese, written on a fan, and presented as a gift to Longfellow himself across the huge distance from China all the way to America. Though Longfellow enjoyed a very high international reputation in the 19th century, Qian Zhongshu did not think so highly of him or his literary merits. "There are a great many major poets in the West. Perversely however the first to be introduced into China happened to be Longfellow," he complains. "Longfellow wrote quite a few good or comparatively good poems, but again perversely, it so happened that the first to be translated into Chinese was 'A Psalm of Life.' To professors of literature and literary critics alike, this fact can be considered a minor taunt or provocation on the part of the history of literary relations between nations!" Qian even goes on to comment on the translation of Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" as an example of the discrepancy between "what is" and "what ought to be," of history "playing practical jokes on us." All these are of course predicated on the assumption that Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" was indeed the first poem ever translated into Chinese. In recent years, however, this assumption has been challenged by scholars based on their study of the interactions between Christian missionaries and Chinese culture in the late Ming and the early Qing period.

In an article published in the Shanghai newspaper *Wen Hui Bao* on April 25, 2005, *Zhou Zhenhe* maintains that if Dong Xun wrote the "Psalm of Life" on a fan and sent it to Longfellow in the mid-1860s, as Qian Zhongshu argued in his essay, then, more than 10 years earlier, John Milton's sonnet "On His Blindness" was already translated into Chinese and came out in 1854 in Chinese Serial *Xia Er Guan Zhen*, a monthly (and occasionally bi-monthly) Chinese-language publication based in Hong Kong, edited by British missionaries Walter Henry Medhurst and James Legge with Medhurst's son-in-law Charles Batten Hillier, who had very little knowledge of Chinese. The Chinese version of the sonnet is in the form of four-character lines, and the well-wrought text shows the hand of a very capable and experienced translator with a discerning eye for important works by a major poet and a firm grasp of the meaning of the original. Unfortunately, the journal did not give out the translator's name. According to Zhou, the Japanese scholar Ishida Yasuo thought it was the work by James Legge, but another scholar *Shen Guowei* believed it to be the product of collaboration between Joseph Edkins and *Jiang Dunfu*, one of the so-called "three musketeers of Shanghai." Though this Milton sonnet was translated into Chinese earlier than Longfellow's "Psalm of Life," says Zhou, we need not rush to declare it to be the very first English poem translated into Chinese, for it is a far more tricky and difficult business to pronounce that nothing can be earlier

than what we have found. In their article published in *Guowai Wenxue* (*Literature Abroad*) no.2, 2005, however, Shen Hong and Guo Hui did make the announcement that Milton's sonnet "On His Blindness" was indeed the first English poem ever translated into Chinese, and that W. H. Medhurst was very likely the translator. Two years later, in the March 2007 issue of *Zhongguo Wenzhe Yanjiu Jikan* (*Journal of Studies in Chinese Literature and Philosophy*), Li Sher-shiueh published another article to argue that the Jesuit missionary Giulio Aleni's (1582 – 1649) translation of a Christian text into Chinese, *Shengmeng ge* (*Ode to a Holy Dream*), a dialogue between the body and the spirit, which came out in 1637, should be the first "English" poem translated into Chinese, thus pushing the date of the first Chinese translation of a Western poem back two hundred years.

Though the title of his article says "The First English' Poem Translated into Chinese," Li Sher-shiueh makes the point that "the genealogy of knowledge has so developed our consciousness of self-reflection today that what is called 'the first' has long become a rhetorical expediency." [①] The point is indeed well-taken, for as Zhou Zhenhe also notes, it is very difficult to ascertain that no possibility of finding anything earlier exists once one has found an early text. More importantly, whether something comes out as the first in temporal sequence is not in itself the most meaningful point, for it is far more significant whether a translation circulated widely and has had a notable influence on a certain readership. Aleni's *Ode to a Holy Dream* was meant to be used for proselytization in China and was probably known among a small number of Christian converts in the late Ming and early Qing period. As for the Milton sonnet expertly translated into Chinese, it was published in Chinese Serial, a journal edited by Christian missionaries in Hong Kong with a limited circulation and influence, so the translation was unknown to Chinese men of letters and elicited no commentaries from them. Quite different from these earlier translations, Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" was translated by Thomas Wade the British diplomat in China, rephrased by Dong Xun, who "had held a rank somewhat equivalent to that of a vice-minister in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs," written on a Chinese fan, and entrusted to the American diplomat Anson Burlingame to send it to the poet himself in a faraway land across thousands of miles over the sea. So in terms of influence and prestige, the Longfellow translation certainly stands as an important witness to the kind of intellectual interrelations between China and the West in the late Qing period. The essay on the translation of Longfellow's poem, as Qian Zhongshu said himself, forms part of a larger work "on the introduction of Western literature into China during the late Qing period," and more specifically, it "may perhaps serve to enhance our understanding of the vogues of an age that has already long passed." Qian's essay has achieved that purpose brilliantly, and therefore its value is not in any sense diminished even if his assumption—that Longfellow's "Psalm of Life" is the first poem translated into Chinese—has been overturned.

Translation is crucial for the appreciation of literature, and today we realize how important translation is for world literature. Qian's last essay is first of all a comparative study of three works: a passage from the Buddhist *Sutra on Former Births*, an episode from *The Histories* by Herodotus, and a story from Matteo Bandello's *Le Novelle*, in which he finds a sort of Ur-Story, a basic narrative line shared by these very different texts. In addition, it is also a tour de force on his part as an exercise in literary translation, particularly the translation he did of the

① Li Sher-shiueh 李奭學, "Zhong yi diyi shou Ying shi—Ai Rulue Shengmeng ge chutan" 中譯第一首 "英" 詩—艾儒略《聖夢歌》初探 (The First "English" Poem Translated into Chinese: A Preliminary Study of Giulio Aleni's Shengmeng ge," Zhongguo Wenzhe Yanjiu Jikan 中國文哲研究集刊 (Journal of Studies in Chinese Literature and Philosophy), no. 30 (March 2007): 88.

Herodotus's episode in imitation of the Buddhist Sutra, largely in four-character lines with many archaic words and expressions. Qian's imitation of the stylistic features of the Sutra text is superb, and his translation of the Herodotus episode reads very much like an old Buddhist text, but his point is to highlight the excessive and tedious repetitions we find in the Buddhist text in comparison of the other two. "When the three versions are compared," says Qian, "the Buddha's abilities as a storyteller are the most deficient—he drags the story out in a most long-winded manner and runs the gravest danger of causing boredom and inattention amongst his audience." This point of the comparison is of course lost in our text here because we have to quote the English version of the Herodotus text, which Qian used as basis of his Chinese translation.

In the three essays related to translation, Qian Zhongshu has made it very clear that translation is difficult, treacherous, but also fascinating and transformative. Lin Shu's translation, however faulty and error-ridden, has played a significant role in introducing Western literature to China, and his contribution outshines any mistakes we may find in his translation. Qian Zhongshu has spoken eloquently of both the values and the difficulties of literary translation. "The highest ideal of literary translation," he says, "is 'to transform.'" When a translation fully expresses what the original says without "forced or inflexible usages," without losing "the flavour of the original work," then it may be considered "to have entered this 'realm of transformation.'" But on the other hand, translation is always a difficult journey leading from the original as the point of departure to the translated text as the point of arrival. "The path that leads between these two points is an exceedingly tortuous one," says Qian, "and the original, buffeted by hardships and encountering every sort of peril along the way, will inevitably suffer loss or damage. All translations therefore are, in part, untrue to their originals and serve to distort them." A good translation, therefore, does a great service in transferring the original from one language to another with as little loss as possible, and thereby gives the original a lease of new life in a new medium.

Readers of this volume should feel fortunate that we have in Duncan Campbell an excellent translator, who has provided us with a fluent, highly readable, and highly reliable translation of Qian Zhongshu's enormously learned essays, that is to say, essays enormously difficult to translate. Beyond the usual difficulties of literary or scholarly translation, Qian's text is challenging because of its typical intertextuality, with numerous quotations from classical Chinese texts as well as texts in half a dozen European languages. As translator, Campbell has done a huge amount of research to check Qian's sources, provide some additional information for the many persons he mentioned and book titles he cited, and a great amount of other such reference details. This is obviously a labour of love, the result of many years' hard work, and I am convinced that no book can be a better volume to initiate our East Asian Comparative Literature and Culture series than Campbell's translation of Qian Zhongshu's critical essays, which may well serve as a model for the kind of scholarly work we all try to do in East-West cross-cultural studies.

November 7, 2013

【About The Author】Zhang Longxi, Director of the CUHK Cross-cultural Research Center, City University of Hong Kong.

双语经典

《七缀集》管窥

张隆溪 著　洪庆福 杜盈俊 译

DOI:10.16100/j.cnki.cn32-1815/c.2015.01.011

放眼海内外，钱锺书（一九一〇–一九九八）堪称学富五车的人文主义学者，比之埃里希·奥尔巴赫 (Erich Auerbach) 与恩斯特·罗伯特·库尔提斯 (Ernst Robert Curtius) 两位大家也毫不逊色，而且，钱先生精通五六门欧洲语言（包括英语、法语、德语、意大利语、西班牙语和拉丁语等），不仅在西方文化方面有着深厚的造诣，又深谙中国古典文化，是一位百科全书式的学者。一九八三年，李克曼在法国《世界报》上撰文称钱锺书"在中国文化、西方文化、乃至世界文化等诸方面均学识独具，在今日之中国，乃至全世界，都很难有人与之相比"。[①]我曾在不同场合三复斯言，因为我深知此等美誉恰如其分，极其中肯。不过，尽管钱先生博学多艺，在中国享有盛誉，并于一九八五年当选美国现代语言学会荣誉会员，但在西方，除了少数汉学家，钱先生本人及其作品依旧鲜为人知。虽然如此，不争的是，钱先生的学识远远超出汉学或海外中国文学研究，其代表作《管锥编》（译为"*Limited Views*"）纂在自谦的管锥，究其宏旨，实乃一部典型的跨学科论著。是书与西方著述展开互文对话，点评中国典籍，见解独到，指涉诸科，无所不包，难以按图书分类法归以类属。[②]钱先生的作品代表了当代学界的顶尖水平，值得大力推崇，因此，对其译作予以刊行，并对有关其作品的文学批评付诸印刷，委实是必要之举。

随着世界对中国文化的兴趣日益浓厚，钱先生的著作在西方学界少有人问津的情形在近年来多有改观，其作品的英译本也渐次与西方读者见面。《围城》这部被夏志清（C.T.Hsia）誉为"尽显当代流行元素，纷呈作家丰富的幽默表现力及其对悲剧的洞察力"[③]的钱先生唯一的一部小说，已由学者珍妮·凯利（Jeanne Kelly）和毛讷森（Nathan Mao）合译而成，于一九七九年在印第安纳大学出版社（Indiana University Press）出版，并于二〇〇四年由新导航出版社（New Direction Press）重印发行；此外，钱锺书的学术代表作《管锥编》这部集知识与智慧为一体的

① Pierre Ryckmans, "Fou de chinois," *Le Monde*, June 10, 1983, p. 15.

② In my university library, the book is put under PL anyway, but that is totally arbitrary and misleading, because PL usually covers books in Chinese literature.

③ C. T. Hsia, *A History of Modern Chinese Fiction*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1971), p. 434.

中国文学瑰宝，现已完成部分英译并面世。学者罗爱郎诺（Ronald Egan）从原先五卷内容中节选并译为六十五篇文章，定译名为 *Limited Views*，于一九九八年由哈佛大学亚洲中心（Harvard University Asia Center）出版；钱锺书先生的散文和短篇小说集《人·兽·鬼》（*Humans, Beasts, and Ghosts*）已由学者克里斯托弗·李（Christopher Rea）编译而成，在二〇一一年由哥伦比亚大学出版社（Columbia University Press）出版。钱锺书的作品中还有一部由七篇短文连缀而成的名为《七缀集》(Qi zhui ji) 的重要散文集，邓肯·坎贝尔（Duncan Campbell）将之译为 *Patchwork: Seven Essays on Art and Literature*，并作为首册收录于由布里尔（Brill）出版社出版的"东亚比较文学与文化系列丛书"。

《七缀集》最早出版于一九八四年。钱锺书在本书中用平易的白话在特定专题上展开持续性的讨论，使其有别于其他两部巨著——《管锥编》和《谈艺录》皆使用文言笔记的写作体式。用白话撰写的《七缀集》虽然代表了评论的现代形式，但正如他过往所有作品一样，《七缀集》同样旁征博引，征引内容涉及古文和数种欧洲语言。钱先生在文集第一篇——《中国诗与中国画》的开篇伊始就说明，"这不是一篇文艺批评，而是文艺批评史上一个问题的澄清，它并不对中国旧诗和旧画试作任何估价，而只是阐明中国传统批评对于诗和画的比较估价"。这种比较批评用批评诗画的方法之所以十分必要，是由于自宋朝以降，人们通常有着这样的传统观点，认为诗是"有声画"（无形画），画是"有形诗"（无声诗），就好像这两种艺术形式是孪生姊妹，有着同样的美学评判标准。明朝著名画家和学者董其昌（一五五五－一六三六）模仿禅学的南北派别，将传统的绘画也分为南北两派，并提出此分类与禅学一样起源于唐代。南派画家以唐朝诗人、画家王维（七〇一－七六一）为创始人。他的确创立了正统的传统绘画流派，然而他在诗歌方面他所创立的"神韵派"（即和南派绘画风格一致的诗歌），却无法代表旧诗正宗。虽然王维也是唐代著名诗人，但他在传统旧诗中的地位永远无法与杜甫、李白或陶渊明相提并论。通过举证大量文献资料，钱锺书阐明了旧诗、旧画批评中的一个根本分歧："我们知道中国旧诗不单纯是'灰暗诗歌'，不能由'神韵派'来代表。但是，我们也往往忽视一个事实：神韵派在旧诗传统里公认的地位不同于南宗在旧画传统里公认的地位，传统文评否认神韵派是标准的诗风，而传统画评承认南宗是标准的画风。在'正宗'、'正统'这一点上，中国旧'诗、画'不是'一律'的。"换而言之，诗画"一律"的传统理论站不住脚，经不起细细的推敲。

诗与画号称姊妹艺术，这同样也是西方批评家们的传统观点。古罗马诗人霍拉斯（Horace）的名句"诗会像画"（ut picture poesis），经后人断章取义便形成了"诗原通画"的观点。钱锺书认为，诗、画是孪生姐妹的说法是千余年西方文艺理论的奠基石，而这正是莱辛（Gotthold Ephraim Lessing）所要扫除的绊脚石。文集中第二篇杂文即是对莱辛的名著《拉奥孔》的多方阐释。钱锺书在文中提出的第一个重要观点就是：批判性的见解与独到的看法往往存在于无意的只言片语和零碎的片段思维中，虽然谈不上有什么理论体系，却可能同系统的长篇大论有着同样的价值。事实上，理论既可建立亦可随时推翻。钱锺书指出，"往往整个理论系统剩下来的有价值的东西只是一些片断思想"。"眼里只有长篇大论而瞧不起只言片语，那是一种粗浅甚至庸俗的看法——假使不是懒惰的借口。"

以此为依据，钱锺书进一步提出，从一些中国只言片语的古语中，可以看出中国古人早已悟出和莱辛一致的观点，即绘画作为一门空间艺术，无法表现动作和事情，但诗歌作为时间艺术却能将"情、事"表达得游刃有余。在钱锺书援引的诸多例证中，令人印象尤为深刻的是画家顾恺之（约三四五－约四〇〇）评说嵇康的两行诗：手挥五弦易，目送归鸿难。也就是说，诗句所描绘的瞬间动作"手挥五弦"在绘画中很容易表现，而"目送归鸿"是持续进行的活动，且"目"与"归"既包含飞鸟从空中向目的地飞行的过程，也包含人目送飞鸟时随着它的飞行越眺越远的过程，是无法用一幅画来表现的。钱锺书认为：顾恺之所作的这一精辟评论说明他已然悟出"这里确有莱辛所说的时间上的承先启后的问题"。

然而，除了莱辛已提及的绘画无法表现时间维度外，还有很多其他无法表现的因素，因而莱辛的理论并不周密。很多中国古诗所描绘的感官层面或心情的内容，例如嗅觉（“香”）、触觉（“湿”、“冷”）、听觉（“声咽”、“鸣钟作磬”）以及内心状态（“思乡”）等任何无明显外部表现的内容，都无法通过绘画来表达。正如钱锺书所强调，“这并非仅仅是时间与空间的问题”。除此以外，诗人描绘色彩“虚”、“实”的渐变同样也难以通过画来表现。例如，李贺（七九〇－八一六）用“鬼灯如漆照松花”来形容鬼火；弥尔顿（John Milton）则将地狱描绘成“没有光明，只是一片可以照见的黑暗”（No light, but rather darkness visible）以及“魔鬼向天使开炮，射出一道‘黑火（black fire）’”。“鬼灯如漆”、“可以照见的黑暗”以及“黑火”都是无法画出来的，至少画不出诗歌所能体现的效果。所以说，很平常的一个比喻都有可能让画家心生绝望。究其根源，在于比喻的基本准则是将两种不同的事物放到一起，而所比的事物既要有相同之处，否则就无法合拢，又要有不同之处，否则无法分辨。画家基于自身对比喻的理解，是无法画出两个事物之间既相同又不同的微妙关系的。比方说，我们可将山峰比作驼峰，但作画时如果将山画成骆驼状，这是相当怪异并且无论如何都是不恰当的。这些方面莱辛在《拉奥孔》中都未曾提及，可以说，是钱锺书的论证将莱辛的理论扩展到了一个更广的层面。

钱锺书在《读拉奥孔》一文中着重强调指出，莱辛对文学艺术理论的一大重要贡献在于他提出的意味深长的“片刻（Augenblick）理论。绘画作为一门空间艺术是静态的，画家只能描述某一特定时刻的景象。这一特定时刻如同女子怀有身孕的过程，既包含从前种种，也蕴含着未来种种，所以，画家如何根据这种种可能来选择要表现的那一“片刻”的景象就显得尤为关键。文学叙事作为一门时间艺术，能够从头至尾将整个故事娓娓道来，不受时间的限制。作家依旧可以使用“片刻”的概念来达到不同的文学效果。就这一点，钱锺书指出：通常诗文中的叙述“有时偏偏见首不见尾，紧临定点，就收场落幕，让读者得之言外。换句话说，‘富于包孕的片刻’那个原则，在文学艺术里同样可以应用”。在钱先生引用的诸多例证中，批评家金圣叹（一六一〇？－一六六一）在钱先生眼中似乎最看重“片刻”这种叙事手法。金圣叹曾如此解释“片刻”的妙处：“文笔最妙，是目注此处，却不便写，却去远远处发来，迤逦写到将至时，便且住，如是更端数番。”换句话说，在叙事小说中，作家顺势而为，引领读者一步步接近故事高潮，到高潮处便故意打住，因而引得读者意犹未尽，反倒激起更多的关注和好奇，急切地欲知后事分解。钱锺书的想法与金圣叹的观点不谋而合：“那些‘富于包孕的片刻’显然在长篇故事中普遍运用，并不限于中国章回体小说。”钱先生进一步指出，此类引得读者心痒情急的手法不仅限于中国小说，而且还广泛运用于欧洲小说和叙事诗之中。为了证实自己的观点，钱锺书从但丁、契诃夫、乔治·桑、鲁德维希、亚理奥斯多以及瑞德的作品中收集了大量的文本，加上中国文学作品中的丰富例证，提出一切“包孕的片刻”及其叙事技巧都属于莱辛所提出的理论概念范畴。钱先生在文中写道：“莱辛讲‘富有包孕的片刻’，虽然是特指造型艺术的说法，却无意中也为文字艺术提供了一个有用的概念。”如此，钱锺书成功地将莱辛的理论成果推向公众，使读者了解了富于包孕的“片刻”这一概念的重要性，以及在文学和美术领域广泛运用这一技巧的方法。

《七缀集》中前两篇文章探讨了诗与画。后两篇《通感》和《诗可以怨》则构成了另一理论方向的研究。《通感》以诗人宋祁（九九八－一〇六一）《玉楼春》中的著名诗句——“红杏枝头春意闹”作为开头，陈述了几位文人对于诗人用“闹”字来描绘“春意”提出的异议。接着，钱锺书援引了若干宋代文人的看法，并表达了自己的意见，说明宋祁的用词并无不妥。钱锺书认为，“闹字是把事物无声的姿态说成好像有声音的波动，仿佛在视觉里获得了听觉的感受。”如此看似缺乏逻辑的用法和感官上的混乱并非仅在中国诗歌中出现，西方语言中也有“loud”、“criard”、“chiassoso”、“chillón”，以及“knall”这类词，原意都是形容吵闹声，但也用来描述鲜亮的色彩。钱锺书认为此类西方词

汇“有助于理解古汉语诗词里的‘闹’字”，指出，“用心理学或语言学的术语来说，这是‘通感’（synaesthesia）或‘感觉挪移’（the transference of the sense）的例子”。

钱锺书作品的一大鲜明特征是善于引用大量中西文学文本例证。《通感》中同样博引文例来证实“通感”无处不在：从日常用语中常见的词、句到诗性话语，再到哲学思辨；从亚里士多德提出的“声音有‘尖锐’(sharp) 和‘钝重’(heavy) 之分，那比拟着触觉而来”，到中国《礼记·乐记》中有关音效的形象描述；从唐代诗人白居易《琵琶行》中对音乐的描写到西方文学中的典型例子；从荷马的诗句到十九世纪末象征主义诗人的作品；从西方神秘主义到中国佛教、道教教义中“把各种感觉打成一片、混作一团的神秘经验”。钱锺书将以上丰富的例证结合起来用以强调“通感”举足轻重的地位，并在此基础上更为敏锐地指出，虽然这一术语在中西文化中都得到了广泛运用，但“古代批评家和修辞家却似乎都没有认识和理解‘通感’这种修辞手法”——“即便是伟大的哲学家亚里士多德，在《批评论》里虽提到了通感，而他的《修辞学》里却只字不谈”。但也正是因为这种忽略，才使钱锺书的发现显得尤为珍贵。正是因为钱先生将“通感”引入批评并予以详论，我们才开始了解这一全新的发现并得以从新的角度重新审视和理解他所列举的那些文学例证。

《诗可以怨》一文，亦如其题旨所示，同样是一个重要的批判概念。与《通感》一样，《诗可以怨》也没有过度在意传统批判理论。孔子曾在《论语·阳货》中如此评价诗歌的功能：“诗可以兴、可以观、可以群、可以怨。”钱锺书在文中只探讨了其中一种功能，而且是最后一种功能——怨。他通过征诸中西文化传统，列举尼采、弗洛伊德、克罗齐、司马迁（约公元前一四五 – 八五）、钟嵘（约四六五 – 五一八）以及韩愈（七六八 – 八二四）的作品，清晰地证实了“痛苦比快乐更能产生诗歌。好诗主要是不愉快、烦恼或‘穷愁’的表现和发泄”在中西文化中的普遍存在性。笔者记得，在一九八一年，亦或在一九八二年，在北京巧遇钱先生，闲聊时先生清楚地告诉我，这篇文章的题目《诗可以怨》虽出自孔子的《论语》，但如若将来将文章译成英文版，可参照雪莱《致云雀》(*To a Skylark*) 中的“最甜美的歌曲往往倾诉者最悲的情由（Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought）”诗句，将题目译为“*Our Sweetest Songs*”，因为雪莱的这句诗完美地诠释了《诗可以怨》这篇文章的精髓。

钱锺书在文中引用了大量的例证，其中一个显得尤为突出，即用蚌病成珠的譬喻来阐述“诗可以怨”的观念。刘勰（约四六五 – 五二二）在《文心雕龙》中使用过一个独特的类比来评论东汉文人冯衍的作品，说他的佳作皆为才华不得赏识后郁郁不得志，进而发愤的成果。刘勰因而将冯衍的际遇同“蚌病成珠”等同起来。另一位学者刘昼（五一四 – 五六五）在“梗柟郁蹙以成缛绵之瘤，蚌蛤结疴而衔明月之珠”中也表达了类似的观点。这两位学者所用珍珠的比喻皆源于淮南王刘安（公元前一七九 – 一二二）的作品，其大意是：如明月般闪亮的珍珠对人而言是宝贵的，但对蚌蛤而言则是病症。[①]这一有趣的点评改变了人们一贯的看法——光彩夺目的珍珠不再只是珠宝，而是害病的蚌蛤疼痛的产物。这本身就是看待事物方式的非凡转变。当这一新观点被批评家们借以论述文学创作时，便成了形容诗歌佳作必源于郁结和发愤的妙语。然而这一特殊的比喻并非仅见于汉语，在西方文学里亦能找到。钱锺书对此是这样表述的：“西洋人谈起文学创作，取譬巧合得很。格里巴尔泽 (Franz Grillparzer) 说诗好比害病不作声的贝壳动物所产生的珠子 (die Perle，das Erzeugnis deskranken stillen Muscheltieres)；福楼拜以为珍珠是牡蛎染疾而成 (la perle est une maladie de l'hui tre)；作者的文笔却是最深沉的痛苦的流露 (l'écou-lement d'une douleur plus profonde)。海涅诘问：诗之于诗人，是否正如珍珠之于可怜的牡蛎，是痛苦的源泉。(wie die Perle，die Krankheitsstoff，woran das arme Austertier leidet)。豪斯门 (A.E.Housman) 说诗是一种分泌 (a secretion)，可以像松树的树脂（like

① Ouyang Xun 欧阳询 (557 – 641), *Yiwen leiju* 艺文类聚 [*Literary Texts Classified in Categories*], ed. Wang Shaoying 汪绍楹, 2 vols. (Shanghai: Shanghai guji, 1982), 2:1675.

the turpentine in the fir）这样自然的分泌，或是像牡蛎的珍珠 (like the pearl in the oyster) 那样病态的（morbid）分泌。珍珠和牡蛎这种类比被大家广为采纳，可能就是因为它非常贴切的指出了诗是情绪的产物，是怨的媒介。”

读完上述文字，我们不得不惊叹于中西方诗人在文学心理上的契合。尽管中西方语言与文化有着巨大的文化差异，但依旧能在诗歌比喻上存在如此惊人的大量巧合。除了理论部分，钱锺书的博古通今同样令读者佩服得五体投地。他不仅博览群书，记忆力惊人，更能将不同语言文学中以珍珠作比喻的文献资料逐一细细过目、分类，进而提出一切震撼人心的诗歌在创作之初诗人必定是如同“蚌病成珠”一般经历过无数的痛苦和煎熬。当钱锺书向读者列举大量文学作品和文学批评之时，我们对孔子在《论语》所言，对刘勰的珍珠之譬，都突然间具有了新的审视目光，无论是对于文学创作，还是对于文学鉴赏，“蚌病成珠”这一批评话语都具有深远的影响。

《七缀集》剩余的三篇文章皆与文学作品的翻译与接受相关。前两篇文章追溯了晚清文化风貌，是时，西方文学通过译介进入中土，不无惊诧、不无冒险般地进入了一个迥异的文化。作为一位伟大的小说家、讽刺作家和文化历史学家，钱锺书在这三篇文章中向读者生动地再现了清末的知识图景，使读者有机会窥探彼时精英文人的知识结构与文化精神。《林纾的翻译》一文中所谈论的翻译家林纾（一八五二－一九二四）是清末旧派学者，本身不通晓任何外语，却在多位助手的协助下完成了一百七十多部西方小说的翻译。他虽然在翻译上成就斐然，但作为一名古文学家，他更注重自己古文方面的造诣，因而不喜旁人忽略其文笔之力而直接谈论其翻译之功。康有为（一八五八－一九二七）曾专门写诗赞誉林纾“译才并世数严林”，本意是说当今中国最伟大的翻译家非严复和林纾莫属，但康有为没想到他的这句称赞实际上既没讨好林纾，同时还又得罪了严复。严复向来瞧不起林纾，看见那首诗，就说康有为胡闹：“天下哪有一个外国字都不认识的‘译才’”；而林纾也并不乐意，一来因为康有为“首先该讲自己的古文，为什么倒去讲翻译小说”，二来这首诗中，严复本应是个陪客，康有为却将其名字放到林纾之前，喧宾夺主。对此，钱锺书的评论则显得较为轻松幽默：“文人好名，争风吃醋，历来作为笑柄。只要它不发展为无情、无义、无耻的倾轧和陷害，终还算得‘人间喜剧’（la Comédie humaine）里一个情景轻松的场面”。回顾这段历史，我们或许应该感叹当时林纾及其同行能身处无害的“文坛之争”实在是一件幸运的事。“无情、无义、无耻的倾轧和陷害”在后来的学者中盛行，并在很长一段时间内毒害了中国的社会风气。

其实，清末民初的文人对翻译并不看重，他们甚至质疑洋人能否写得出任何诗作或者什么文学作品。鸦片战争后，对那些文学精英们来说，文化自尊愈发不可忽缺，因为人人都意识到中国无法在船坚炮利和器物层面与洋人抗衡，剩下的也就只有文学了。钱锺书在备注中写到：“他们不得不承认中国在科学上不如西洋，就把文学作为民族优越感的根据。”钱先生同时也提到，“其他东方古国的人也抱过类似态度，龚古尔 (Edmond de Goncourt) 就记载波斯人说：欧洲人会制造表，会造各种机器，能干得很，然而还是波斯人高明，试问欧洲也有文人、诗人么 (si nous avons des littérateurs, des poètes)？”虽然林纾并没有把自己的译作看成他全部著述的重要部分，他至少深知洋人小说有翻译的价值，正如钱锺书所言，“在这一点上林纾的坚实超越了比他才高学博的前辈”。这里不得不提到钱锺书《七缀集》中另一篇和翻译相关的文章——《汉译第一首英语诗〈人生颂〉及有关二三事》，文中提到了同文馆第一批高材生之一张德彝（一八四七－一九一九），并把张德彝和林纾作比较。张德彝精通英语，并多次被派往欧美担任清廷驻外使节。他习惯将国外见闻以日记形式详细记录，但他本人从未对西方文学产生兴趣，更谈不上什么理解，以至于在日记中误将讽世寓言《格列佛游记》(*Gulliver's Travels*) 看成是某非洲部落的真实故事。钱锺书在文中写道：“当张德彝在伦敦写下这一幼稚见解时，一辈子没出过洋的林纾和大学没毕业的魏易在中国翻译《格列佛游记》呢。”他进一步指出，“如果将

林纾的《海外轩渠录》前言和张德彝关于《格列佛游记》的那节日记对读一下，不难分辨谁更了解西方文学。”

由于自身不懂任何外语，加上助手外语程度浅薄，林纾的译作存在很多错误，漏译、误译比比皆是，十分荒谬。虽然读着令人捧腹，但钱锺书并未调侃这些失误。相反，他认为，当中国多数文人都选择对一切西方文化视而不见的时候，林纾却能将西方文学传递给中国读者。对于林纾在其中所充当的“媒”的角色，钱锺书深表敬佩。他在文中回忆了自己幼时阅读林纾那些生动、迷人的作品时的愉悦心情，并称之为“我十一二岁时的大发现”。林纾的译作使他发现“西洋小说会那么迷人”。翻译原是为了省事方便，免去读者阅读原著的烦恼，但译著有时会将读者“讹”进国外的世界，结果反而惹得他们对原著无限向往。这就是钱锺书年少时遇到的情况。他这样回忆那段时光：“我把林译哈葛德、迭更司、欧文、司各德、斯威佛特的作品反复不厌地阅览。假如我当时对学习英语有什么自己意识到的动机，其中之一就是有一天能够痛痛快快地读遍哈葛德以及旁人的探索小说。”虽然翻译作为语言和文化的媒介有时会歪曲原著、误导读者，但翻译对民族间的文化交流是不可或缺的关键。钱锺书说，“翻译是个居间者或联络员，介绍大家去认识国外作品，引诱大家去爱好国外作品，仿佛作媒似的，使国与国之间缔结了‘文学因缘’，缔结了国与国之间的较少反目、吵嘴、分手挥拳等危险的‘因缘’”。

的确，当两种文化第一次相遇时，虽然翻译过程通常困难重重，误译、漏译不断，却踏出了相互理解的第一步，架起了跨越语言、文化差异的桥梁。这些困难、误译、漏译的价值和意义也就在于此。跨出了第一步，才有了今日文化交流的成就。也许，也正是前人的诸多误译、生硬的表达、故意改动原文等诸多问题，才成就了钱锺书精彩的文章——《汉译第一首英语诗〈人生颂〉》。在这篇文章中，钱锺书通篇运用幽默和讽刺，生动再现了当时的历史画卷。文中提及了《人生颂》的最早两位译者：威妥玛 (Thomas Wade)（一八一八－一八九五）和董恂（一八一〇－一八九二）。前者本是翻译官出身，十九世纪六十年代中期被破格提升为英国驻华公使，他虽贵为公使，却仍不忘旧业，完成了《人生颂》的初译；后者当时负责清廷的对外事务，他将威妥玛的初译稿转译成七言绝句，并将诗题于扇上赠予他人，后辗转由美国外交家蒲安臣 (Anson Burlingame)（一八二〇－一八七〇）于一八六五年在麻省剑桥的克雷奇之屋转赠予原诗作者朗费罗。威妥玛的汉语功底显然无法将朗费罗的诗完美译成中文，因而他的译文显得晦涩难懂。董恂不懂洋文，因而当他在威妥玛本就不算高明的译文基础上加以改进时，只能一知半解，几乎完全曲解了朗费罗原诗的意思。对此钱锺书嘲讽道：“董恂的译诗倒暗合赫尔德 (Johann Gottfried Herder) 的主张：译者根据、依访原作而作出自己的诗。”不幸的是，董恂不是直接根据朗费罗的原作，而是依据“威妥玛词意格格不入的译文”，结果反而译成了四不像。钱锺书不无讽刺道：“弗罗斯托 (Robert Frost) 给诗下了定义：诗就是‘在翻译中丧失掉的东西’(What gets lost in translation)。摩尔根斯特恩认为诗歌翻译只分坏和次坏的两种 (Es gibt nur schlechte Übersetzungen und weniger schlechte)。”他认为朗费罗《人生颂》早期的两个译本完全证实了上述对“坏”文学翻译的讽刺。

诚然，要在这两篇年代久远又不完整的译作中纠错易如反掌。但当我们回顾那个年代的社会历史背景时，不禁感叹像朗费罗《人生颂》这样的诗歌居然在那时就出现了中文译本！众所周知，中国传统思想中民族优越感根深蒂固，中国人习惯将本民族称为“华”，意为文明人；外族则被统称为“夷”，意为蛮人。钱锺书指出：这种思想“在中国有悠久的传统”。中国人称蛮夷为鸟兽殊类，语不可晓。儒家著作《周礼·秋官司寇》早就说过“‘掌与鸟言’或‘掌与兽言’的官该派‘闽蛮’和‘貉狄’去当”，因为“蛮夷和鸟兽时能彼此通话的”。古希腊人也持有相似观念，而且，动物象征也在不同的文化中表现为多种多样的使用形式和方式。劳埃德（G.E.R Lloyd）指出：动物不仅被用来象征人类特质，更普遍用于“指代异族，称他们为动物或像动物一样（这种观念在现代欧洲早期尤为兴

盛）”。[①]清代末年，这种偏见在士大夫阶层中依旧盛行。钱锺书在文中记载了这样一件事：一八八七年，晚清政坛一位极具影响力的人物翁同龢（一八三〇 – 一九〇四）在日记中写到，临近农历新年，各国使节前来拜年，“余避西壁，遥望中席，约有廿余人，曾侯与作夷语，啁啾不已”。曾纪泽是晚清政坛为数不多的懂“夷语”之人，但无论是说英语还是法语，“到了对洋鬼子远而避之的翁同龢耳朵里，只是咭咭呱呱，没完没了的鸟叫”。在这样一种文化环境下，懂外文的中国官员少之又少，更不用说通晓什么外国文学了。不仅顽固的保守派是如此，甚至负责外交事务、派驻海外的使节亦完全不了解西方文化。

钱锺书在文中以李凤苞（一八三七 – 一八八七）为例，揭示了当时社会由过度的文化自尊引发的对他国文化的淡漠与无知。一八七八年，美国驻德使节、歌德小说《浮士德》的著名译者耶台勒（Bayard Taylor）在柏林逝世，中国驻德使节李凤苞参加葬礼后在日记中写道：耶台勒的葬礼让他了解了歌德不仅“为德国学士巨擘”，更是“萨孙外末公聘之掌政府，俄王赠以爱力山得宝星，法王赠以十大字宝星”。这是歌德的名字第一次在中国文献记载中出现，而李凤苞居然只是在参加耶台勒的葬礼时顺便知晓歌德的。钱锺书对于此事的评论难掩嘲讽：“现任的中国官通过新死的美国官得知上代的德国官，官和官之间是有歌德自己所谓‘选择亲和势’(Wahlverwandtschaften) 的。”虽然清政府派往欧洲和美国的官员皆为通晓中国文化的大诗人、大作家，但其中如郭嵩焘、曾纪泽、薛福成等人的日记和著作中都“只字未提起莎士比亚”。

在这样的大背景下，朗费罗的《人生颂》被第一个翻译成中文，题诗于扇，最后千里迢迢作为礼物回到原作者手中，这是多么绝妙的巧合！虽然朗费罗在十九世纪享有很高的国际声誉，但钱锺书认为其作品名不副实：“西洋的大诗人很多，第一个介绍到中国来的偏偏是朗费罗。”钱先生对此始终耿耿于怀：“朗费罗的好诗或较好的诗也不少。第一首译为中文的诗偏偏是《人生颂》。那可算是文学交流史对文学教授和评论家的小小嘲讽或挑衅！”他甚至进一步毫不留情地评价朗费罗这首诗的译文是“是这样”和“应该这样”两者老合不拢的典型例证，并将这种现象称之为“历史的教训”。当然，上述言论是基于朗费罗的《人生颂》确实是第一首译成中文的英文诗这一假设成立的基础上的。而近几年来，基于对明末清初基督教传教士与中国文化交流方面的研究，不断有学者对钱锺书的这一推断提出了质疑。

周振鹤于二〇〇五年四月二十五日在上海《文汇报》撰文指出，若真如钱锺书所言是董恂在十九世纪六十年代中期将《人生颂》的中译本写在扇子上赠与朗费罗的话，那么早在十年前，弥尔顿的十四行诗《哀失明》就已经译成中文，并于一八五四年刊登在香港中文月刊（有时是双月刊）《遐迩贯珍》上了。此刊由英国传教士麦都思（Walter Henry Medhurst）、理雅各（James Legge）以及麦都思的女婿奚礼尔（Charles Batten Hillier）主编。这几位对汉语知之甚少，而刊登的这首十四行诗被译为四言体诗，翻译之精巧体现出译者扎实的功底以及对原诗意思的精准把握。可惜的是，刊物对译者未置一词。根据周振鹤的研究，日本学者石田（Ishida Yasuo）认为这是理雅各的译作，而另一位学者沈国威则坚称这是由艾约瑟（Joseph Edkins）与所谓“海天三友”之一的蒋敦复合译而成。周振鹤同时也承认，虽然弥尔顿十四行诗的中文译本确实先于朗费罗的《人生颂》出版，我们也不必急于宣称这就是中国第一首译成汉语的英文诗，因为随意断言不会再有更早的汉译英诗，这属于学风不严谨。沈弘和郭晖在《国外文学》二〇〇五年第二期发表的文章中得出了这样的结论：米尔顿的《哀失明》是第一首译为汉语的英文诗，而麦都思则极有可能是译者。两年后，李奭学（Li Sher-shiueh）在《中国文哲研究集刊》二〇〇七年三月刊上发表文章指出，耶稣会传教士艾儒略（Giulio Aleni）（一五八二 – 一六四九）早在一六三七年就将基督教一首有关肉体与心灵对话的《圣梦歌》(*Ode to a Holy Dream*) 译成中文。李奭学认为，这才是中国现存最早的英译汉诗

---

① G. E. R. Lloyd, *Ancient Worlds, Modern Reflections: Philosophical Perspectives on Greek and Chinese Science and Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004), p.102.

歌。这样看来，中国最早出现西方诗歌译作的时间应该再向前推进二百年。

虽然李奭学的文章题为《中译第一首“英诗”》，但他同时也强调：“在知识系谱学已高度发达的今天，所谓‘第一’早已变成修辞权宜。”[①]这一观点也得到了其他学者的广泛认可。周振鹤也表达过类似的观点，认为即便有学者找到一个最早的版本也不能保证没有更早的版本出现。更应该指出的是，研究是否有更早的版本出现本身并无太大意义，研究的真正意义在于所发现的译本是否被广泛传播并在读者中产生举足轻重的影响。艾儒略翻译《圣梦歌》意在对中国人施加宗教影响，只有明末清初少数基督教信徒有所知晓；弥尔顿的十四行诗虽然翻译水平精湛，但由于刊登在基督教传教士在香港创办的刊物上，因而也不为大众所知。这也是上述两首译作普遍被当时中国文人忽略，未作任何评论的原因。与这两篇译作不同的是，朗费罗的《人生颂》由英国外交官威妥玛初译，董恂加以修改而成，并以相当于外交部副部长的身份将诗题于扇上赠予美国外交官蒲安臣，再由他千里迢迢送去美国的，因而就声望和影响而言，朗费罗的《人生颂》的译本理应成为代表晚清时期中西文明交流的见证者。钱锺书告诉我们，他自己撰写《汉译第一首英语诗〈人生颂〉及有关二三事》一文的目的从广义层面上说是介绍晚清西方传入中国的文学作品，从狭义层面而言则是为了加强读者对那个遥远年代文学流行元素的理解。钱先生的文章完全达到了自己的初衷。即使他所提出的朗费罗的《人生颂》是第一首汉译英诗这一假设已被后人推翻，这篇著作本身的价值也不会消失。

翻译在文学欣赏中占有举足轻重的地位，现如今，我们更加了解到了翻译对于世界文学的重要性。钱锺书《七缀集》首先是下述三部著作的比较研究：佛学著作《舅甥经》（*Sutra on Former Births*）节选、古希腊史学家希罗多德的《历史》（*The Histories*）的一个章节，以及取自马太奥·拜戴罗（Matteo Bandello）的《短篇小说集》（*Le Novelle*）中的一则故事，在这一故事中，钱锺书发现了一种“原型故事”，即这些殊异的文本所共享的基本叙事路径。其次，《七缀集》中的最后一篇文章乃是钱先生本人的翻译绝技表演。在此特别值得一提的是他模仿佛学著作《舅甥经》文体，通篇以古文四言体诗的形式翻译希罗多德的《史记》节选。钱先生的模仿无疑是成功的，他对希罗多德《历史》一个章节的译介，读起来与阅读佛学文本没有差分，不过，钱先生的目的是让我们将佛教文本中典型的冗长乏味的重复与其他两个文本相比较。正如他所指出：“三篇相形之下，佛讲故事的本领最差，拉扯得最啰嗦，最使人读来厌倦乏味。”很遗憾，这种对比在钱锺书作品的英译本中无法清晰辨别，因为英译本引用的是希罗多德的英文版，而钱锺书的《一节历史掌故、一个宗教寓言、一篇小说》则是基于他古文四言体诗形式的中文翻译来谈论的。

在《七缀集》后三篇与翻译相关的文章中，钱锺书清楚地告诉人们，译事颇艰，译文逆叛，但同时翻译令人神往，且具有使人脱胎换骨的效果。譬如，林纾的翻译虽漏洞百出，却依旧为西方文学引入中国作出了卓越的贡献，其在翻译上的“功”远大于“过”。钱锺书雄辩地论述了翻译的价值与困难，认为文学翻译的最高境界就是“化境”。把作品从一国文字转变成另一国文字，既不会因译者的习惯差异而露出生硬牵强的痕迹，又不失其原作的风味，那就算得上“化境”了。当然，从另一方面来讲，翻译永远是一个以原著为起点以译著为终点的艰难历程，终始之间，路漫漫，其修也远。原作在其历程中，因道路崎岖不平，或因危机四伏，难免蒙受损失。因此，一切译著在部分意义上多少都会偏离、曲解原著；一部优秀的译作在从源语走向译语的过程中只要尽可能的减少损失，就能使原著在新的语言中获得新的生机。

钱锺书博古通今、中西合璧、旁征博引中欧互文，其文翻译难度极高，异于过往常见的文学翻译。对《七缀集》的忠实读者而言，能请到邓

---

① Li Sher-shiueh 李奭学, “Zhong yi diyi shou Ying shi—Ai Rulue Shengmeng ge chutan” 中译第一首“英”诗—艾儒略《圣梦歌》初探 (The First “English” Poem Translated into Chinese: A Preliminary Study of Giulio Aleni’s Shengmeng ge,” Zhongguo wenzhe yanjiu jikan 中国文哲研究集刊 (Journal of Studies in Chinese Literature and Philosophy), no. 30 (March 2007): 88.

东吴讲堂

生态文明建设是天大的事

——在常熟理工学院“东吴讲堂”上的讲演

方世南

摘　要：生态问题是当代中国的重大民生问题。全国性的以雾霾为显性表现的生态危机快到了天要塌下来的地步。将生态文明建设看作天大的事，反映了当前人与自然关系空前紧张已成为最为重大的事。天大的事就是根本性、关键性和全局性的重大的事。可归结为生态矛盾、生态权益、生态安全、生态执政、生态制度、生态文化等以前没有遇到和没有加以重视的重大的事。既然生态文明建设是天大的事，那么，必须通过牢固确立生态执政观，努力提高全民族的生态文化建设水平，大力推进生态文明制度建设，大力加强生态产业建设和大力培植生态型民间组织，形成一股强大的合力，解决好生态文明建设这一天大的事。

关键词：生态危机；生态文明；建设；人与自然

DOI:10.16100/j.cnki.cn32-1815/c.2015.01.012

生态文明目前既是人文社会科学中的一门显学，又是全球共同从事的重大实践问题。

我今天讲演的题目是“生态文明建设是天大的事”。我从三个方面展开：第一，为什么说生态文明建设是天大的事？第二，说生态文明建设是天大的事，这天大的事究竟包括那些重大的事？第三，既然生态文明建设是天大的事，那么，我们怎么来有效地解决好这些天大的事？

第一，为什么说生态文明建设是天大的事？

所谓“天大的事”，就是最为重大的事。究其本源，是指人与自然关系的事，是生态环境的事，建设好生态文明就是天大的事。

“天”和“地”在中国传统文化中一般指人类赖以生存和发展的生态环境。孔子对于人与“天”（自然界）的关系，有三点特别值得我们注意：一是他提出要“知天命”，就是要人们

肯·坎贝尔这位优秀的翻译家为我们带来如此顺畅、易懂和精准的译本实属幸运。作为本书译者，坎贝尔作了大量的研究工作，一一核对了钱先生引用的每一条文献。为了便于读者阅读和理解，坎贝尔还对文中提及的学者、书名等特意添加了相关介绍以及其他大量注释。《七缀集》的英文译著无疑是坎贝尔爱的写照，是他多年呕心沥血、精心研磨的力作。我坚信，没有任何一本书能比坎贝尔的英译《七缀集》更适合于开我们东亚比较文学和文化系列丛书之先河；我坚信，此一英译必将成为我们所致力于其中的东西方跨文化研究学术典范之作。

二〇一三年七月于香港

【作者简介】张隆溪，香港城市大学比较文学与翻译系讲座教授兼跨文化研究中心主任。

【译者简介】洪庆福，比较文学博士，常熟理工学院教授；杜盈俊，常熟理工学院讲师。